

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANNI HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

GARY SANDOR, Warden,

Respondent.

NO. CV 11-4352-MWF (AGR)

ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the petition, records on file, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Further, the Court has engaged in a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.


Petitioner contends that the magistrate judge “failed to give any reason why [she] submitted the (R-R) to the judge.” (Objections at VII.) The magistrate judge submitted the Report to this Court “pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and General Order No. 05-07” of the Central District. (Report at 1.) Section 636(b)(1)(B) authorizes a district court to “designate a magistrate judge to conduct hearings,

1 including evidentiary hearings, and to submit to a judge of the court proposed
2 findings of fact and recommendations for the disposition, by a judge of the court .
3 . . of applications for posttrial relief made by individuals convicted of criminal
4 offenses.” The Central District refers non-capital state habeas corpus petitions to
5 full-time magistrate judges to prepare a Report and Recommendation for
6 submission to the district court. See General Order 05-07 at 2, 8.

7 Petitioner’s remaining objections have no merit.

8 IT IS ORDERED that judgment be entered denying the petition and
9 dismissing this action with prejudice.

10
11 DATED: May 22, 2013



12 MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28